

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/807,935	03/24/2004	William D. Denison	4800 P 009	5150	
7:	590 06/30/2005		EXAMINER		
Edward L. Bishop FACTOR & LAKE, LTD			ZIMMERMAN, BRIAN A		
1327 W. Washington Blvd.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Suite 5G/H			2635		
Chicago, IL 6	60607		DATE MAILED: 06/30/2005	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				N.		
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/807,935	DENISON ET AL.			
Office Action	Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Brian A. Zimmerman	2635			
The MAILING DAT Period for Reply	E of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	S		
THE MAILING DATE OF - Extensions of time may be availa after SIX (6) MONTHS from the r - If the period for reply specified at - If NO period for reply is specified - Failure to reply within the set or e	THIS COMMUNICATION. ble under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 nailing date of this communication. sove is less than thirty (30) days, a repl above, the maximum statutory period extended period for reply will, by statute ater than three months after the mailing.	Y IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MC 36(a). In no event, however, may a rep y within the statutory minimum of thirty will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTI , cause the application to become ABA g date of this communication, even if tin	oly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this commur NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nication.		
Status						
1) Responsive to com	munication(s) filed on 21 A	nril 2005.				
2a)☐ This action is FINA						
<u> </u>	3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordan	ce with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims						
4a) Of the above dis 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/a 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/ard 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/a	e rejected.	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers						
9) The specification is	objected to by the Examine	er.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
11) The oath or declara	tion is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-15	52.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19					
a) All b) Some 1. Certified cop 2. Certified cop 3. Copies of the application fr	c) None of: ies of the priority document ies of the priority document c certified copies of the prio om the International Burea	s have been received in Aprity documents have been r	plication No eceived in this National Stag	je		
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (P Notice of Draftsperson's Pater Information Disclosure Statem Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/16, 3	nt Drawing Review (PTO-948) ent(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)		mmary (PTO-413) Mail Date ormal Patent Application (PTO-152))		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04) Application/Control Number: 10/807,935

Art Unit: 2635

EXAMINER'S RESPONSE

Status of Application

In response to the applicant's amendment received on 4/21/05. The examiner has considered the new presentation of claims and applicant arguments in view of the disclosure and the present state of the prior art. And it is the examiner's position that claims 1-20 are unpatentable for the reasons set forth in this office action:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 1. Claims 1-4,6-9,11-17,19,20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stengel (5109530) and Lemelson (4354189).

Lemelson shows an unlocking device where a receiver in the reader receives a reply signal from a coded ring, but does not specifically show the power controlling modes claimed. In an analogous art, Stengel teaches a method that is used to save power in a receiver. Stengel's receiver deactivates a circuit for a first time period (tx) in step 310. The receiver then enables the circuit

Application/Control Number: 10/807,935

Art Unit: 2635

for a second time period in step 304. Upon sensing an electromagnetic signal during the second time period, the enabling is extended for a greater time (ty) step 320. The received signal can then be processed because it will be received in its entirety during the extended time. This method saves power in the receiver system.

2. Claims 5,10 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stengel and Lemelson as applied to claims 1,8 and 15 above, and further in view of Stamm (4353064).

In an analogous art, Stamm shows the use of Infrared as an alternative electromagnetic signal (alternative to RF). This has the inherent advantage that the signal does not radiate outside a building and is therefore harder to eavesdrop.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used an infrared signal for communication in the above system since such would provide improved security to the access system.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian A. Zimmerman whose telephone

Art Unit: 2635

number is 571-272-3059. The examiner can normally be reached on Off every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Horabik can be reached on 571-272-3068. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brian A Zimmerman Primary Examiner Art Unit 2635

BAZ